

TARIFF.

MEMORIAL

OF

CITIZENS OF RHODE ISLAND,

Against reducing the Duties on Goods, &c.

FEBRUARY, 11, 1833.

Read, and laid on the table.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

The memorial of the undersigned, a committee of the citizens of the State of Rhode Island, engaged in the manufacture of cotton cloth,

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

That your memorialists have examined, with much attention and anxious interest, the bill and comparative tables reported to the House of Representatives by their Committee of Ways and Means, on the 27th December, 1832, for altering and reducing the duties on foreign goods, wares, and merchandize, imported into the United States. The "basis" of the bill and tables is declared to be made on the quantity and cost of like articles of import of the year 1831. In the "comparative tables" it is stated that the value of all descriptions of cotton cloth imported in the year 1831, amounted to \$14,331,675, and that the duty on that amount, at the rates of the tariff of 1832, would amount to \$5,413,950.

The comparative tables assume that \$14,331,675 will be the probable amount imported under "the bill" now reported by the Committee of Ways and Means, which provides to *reduce* the duty on the *same goods* to the rate of 20 per cent. ad valorem; and the tables assume that *no more* than was imported in the year 1831, or would be under the tariff of 1832, will be imported, although the tariffs of both periods imposed a *much higher* duty than is proposed by the bill.

The same tables state that the import amount of cotton twist, yarn, thread, &c., both brown, bleached, and colored, was, in the year 1831, \$393,414, and that the duty would be, under the tariff of 1832, \$147,530. "The bill" now reported assumes that the *same* quantity and value will proba-

bly be imported when the duty is *reduced to 10 per cent. ad valorem*, instead of the much higher duty provided by the tariff of 1832!! Under the duty, as now proposed by the present "bill," it is to be expected a very large amount will be imported.

Your memorialists further respectfully represent that, in their opinion, in proportion as the duty is *reduced*, so will the importation *increase in quantity and value*; for, in proportion as the domestic manufacturer of like articles is driven from employment by the competition of foreign manufactures, the imports *must* increase to supply the wants and demands of our consumption; and although prices would not eventually be lower in our markets, but would probably advance, after the domestic manufacturer had been annihilated, and the foreigner became possessed of, and *had*, the *control* of the markets, yet the domestic manufacturer would be compelled to leave his employment by the competition of the low price, (and the pauper labor) of foreign countries, employed in the manufacture of the same descriptions of cotton cloth and twist. The change which is proposed to be made by "the bill" will give immediate employment to foreign labor and capital, instead of that of our own.

This brief view does not alone apply to the mere manufacture of cotton cloth and twist, but to many other direct and indirect objects of national wealth, which are sustained and rendered valuable by home manufacturers; such as the mineral, the coasting trade, the agriculture, and the labor of the country.

Your memorialists sincerely believe that, should the rates of duty on cotton cloth be fixed and established as reported by the "bill," instead of \$14,331,675 of value, a much larger amount would be imported, and for a period as long as the country could find means of paying the foreigner; and your memorialists do not deem it extravagant, when they intimate the import will rise to \$30,000,000. The basis of their calculation is, that 250,000 bales of cotton are now annually manufactured in the United States, which make about 330,000 yards of cloth, of the value of from six to twelve cents the yard, or, an average of 9 or 10 cents the yard, is \$31,500,000.

This quantity the country now requires, less what is exported, which may be estimated at about \$1,500,000, leaving 30,000,000 for home consumption. If it is estimated from the inability of the consumers, occasioned by the loss of employment in the "laboring classes," induced by the change proposed in the system of protection, that only one half of what was manufactured at home will, in *future*, be purchased for home use, then, after the destruction of the manufacturing property, there would be imported at least an amount of value of \$15,000,000 to be added to the import of 1831, to supply hereafter the consumption of the country, and even *more* as the population increases. If this estimate is correct, then a duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on \$30,000,000 value will produce \$6,000,000 of revenue; and, instead of *reducing* the amount, would assuredly *increase* it over the estimate of the comparative tables of 1831, \$568,325, and \$3,133,665 *over the amount as estimated by the bill and tables now before the House of Representatives.*

Your memorialists would further respectfully represent, that, in their opinion, should the bill now reported fix and establish the duty on cotton twist or yarn at 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, it would prostrate every cotton spinning manufactory in the country. The cotton yarn twist now spun in the United States is generally from No. 14 to No. 40; but the average may

be stated at No. 22 or No. 24. It is made from our primest cotton. The price of this (No. 24) was in England 10*d.* sterling per pound, or 19 cents, in October last. A duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem would be 1 cent 9 mills, instead of a duty of 15 cents per pound, as by the tariff of 1816, and subsequent tariffs.

Your memorialists respectfully further represent that, should cotton yarn or twist be admitted at a low rate of duty, it would be manufactured in the foreign country, *not from cotton of American growth*, but from the more inferior cotton of the "East Indies," which the British manufacturer is enabled to "work up" into twist or yarn, from the circumstance of low wages, and "pauper labor" in this *particular* branch of manufacture; and although the twist or yarn has tenacity sufficient to weave into cloth, yet, for actual use, has little value; and that the use of foreign cotton *imported* in twist and yarn would be highly injurious to *our culture* of the *article*, and to the various other interests and employments now depending on the use and consumption of our own production.

Your memorialists would further respectfully represent, that, in their examination of the "bill and the comparative tables," it appears that 98,576,928 lbs. of brown sugar was imported in 1831, and the value is stated at \$4,220,993, assuming in the tables the cost to be about 4½ cents per pound, and that a duty of 2 cents per pound would give a protection to the American sugar planter of 46 per cent.

Your memorialists, with respectful deference, represent, that an invoice value of goods, paying a "specific duty," is not much to be relied upon, and respectfully state that the price of "brown sugar" at the *plantations* in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hispaniola, Brazils, Manilla, Isle de France, and the British plantations in the West Indies, does not rise above 2½ cents the pound at the present time, and, for such sugars as are produced in the United States, not above two cents per pound. Then a duty of two cents will afford a protection to the planters in the United States of 100 per cent. on the foreign value, beside the further protection of the freight on the importation, equal to ⅓ or ½ cent. per pound, and certainly securing *over* 100 per cent. protection.

Your memorialists would further represent that, by the same "bill and tables," it is proposed to impose a duty on rolled iron of twenty-four dollars per ton, and on hammered iron 15 dollars per ton. Common sized "rolled iron" costs, in England, from £5 10 to £6, and "hammered iron" costs, in Sweden, £10 sterling on board, "free of charges." The protection afforded to the manufacturers of iron is 83 per cent. on "rolled," and 33 per cent. on "hammered iron," *on the prices in the foreign country*, besides the heavy expense of freight and charges of importing, equal to from 5 to 7 dollars per ton, making the protection equal to 100 per cent. on "rolled iron," and 45 per cent. on "hammered iron."

From this view of "the bill," your memorialists would further respectfully represent, that, whilst the labor of the sugar planter and iron manufacturer are securely protected by certain "*specific duties*" of about *one hundred* per cent. on the actual cost of the articles, the cotton manufacturer is left with the uncertain protection of a duty of twenty per cent. ad valorem, upon the foreign value, and "*invoice value*," which is almost always made at the least possible prices, by invoicing goods at prices in the "*rough or unfinished state*," and at prices of "*inland places of manufacture*," and to other abuses to the injury of the revenue, and the manufacturer, which the law professes, in *some* measure, to protect.

Your memorialists, by way of comparing the great and leading interests of the nation, would further represent that the commercial tonnage of the United States, both "registered" and "enrolled," is something under 2,000,000 tons. This may be estimated of the value of *thirty* dollars per ton on an average of old and new vessels, which would be \$60,000,000. This tonnage is estimated to employ less than 80,000 officers and seamen to navigate and manage the same, which, at *ten* dollars per month wages, is 9,600,000 per annum. The cotton manufacturing capital, including the manufacture of machinery, bleacheries, and print works, was, in 1831, ascertained to be \$44,914,934, and, at *that time*, gave employment to labor, *within their own works* and factories, equal to \$12,155,723 per annum. From this comparison, it appears that the "*wages*," in the manufacturing of cotton and machinery, bleaching and printing cloth, exceeded the whole amount of "*wages*" of manning our whole commercial marine in the foreign and domestic trade.

Your memorialists, with respectful deference, further represent, that the Government has, with the most politic and liberal care and watchfulness, protected this branch of our industry and labor, and even gone so far, in one particular branch, as to give to our citizens the *entire* monopoly of the coasting trade. Not a "foreign vessel" can share in this trade, which embraces and commands the trade of more sea coast, bay, lake, and river "ship navigation," than all the States of continental Europe, commencing with the Dardanelles, and running the coast to the "White sea," till the ship is arrested by "eternal ice," and turning the Black sea, the Baltic sea, and all their bays and rivers. This "*coasting trade*" of the United States then embraces more miles of "*ship or vessel navigation*," and a greater diversity of climate and production, than is enjoyed by all the European States. This home commerce is equal that of a "*world by itself*," and no one can hardly venture to predict what would be the effect on all the various interest connected with it, were it to be abandoned by the protection of the Government, and thrown open to the participation of foreign competition. Your memorialists can hardly anticipate less disastrous consequences, by the abandonment of the protection to our home manufactures, and the *internal labor of the country*.

By the tariff of 1816, which your memorialists respectfully represent was then enacted, in part, with the view of protecting, permanently, the present and future manufactures of the country, a duty was imposed of 6½ cents per square yard on "*cotton cloth*." At the same time, "rolled iron" was to pay a duty of 30 dollars per ton, "hammered iron" 9 dollars per ton, and "brown sugar" 3 cents per pound. This tariff, in the foregoing articles, was meant, and so declared at the time by its advocates, to be a protection "*to encourage and sustain the domestic manufactures of the country*;" and, under the faith of the law and its implied pledge, the manufactures of the country have been established.

It is now proposed to reduce the duty on cotton manufactures "*to 20 per centum ad valorem*," or to a duty equal to from 1 cent to 2 cents the square yard of the *description of cotton cloth* manufactured by the establishments in the United States; whilst on hammered iron the duty is proposed to be *raised* from 9 dollars the ton (as in the tariff of 1816,) to 15 dollars per ton; thereby *increasing* the duty 66 2-3 per cent. on "hammered iron." On rolled iron it is proposed, by the bill, to reduce the duty to 24 dollars per ton, from 30 dollars, as by the tariff of 1816, which is a *reduction* on roll-

ed iron of 20 per cent. By the tariff of 1816 brown sugar paid a duty of 3 cents per pound; by the present bill it is proposed to reduce the duty to 2 cents per pound, equal to a reduction of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. From this view of the different interests of manufactures, the cotton manufacture is to be *destroyed* by the great reductions, and uncertain mode of ascertaining the ad valorem value of the goods imported, coming in competition with that branch, whilst the iron manufacturer is to be further protected than was provided by the tariff of 1816; and the sugar planter is to have a certain protection of at least 100 per cent. on the cost of the foreign article coming in competition with his manufacture.

This comparison of the provisions of the bill, which so much reduces the protection of some branches of domestic manufacture, whilst it retains the protection of 1816, and even increases it on other branches, is made with no invidious feelings, but purely with a view to show the inequality of protection, and of presenting the circumstance to the consideration of Congress.

ED. CARRINGTON,
AMASA MA^{SON},
PHILIP ALLEN,
BENJ. ABORN, } Committee.

